

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/473,136	12/28/1999	THOMAS F. BERGERT	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	9633
7:	590 09/14/2004		EXAMINER	
THOMAS F BERGERT		KALINOWSKI, ALEXANDER G		
4436 N 17TH S ARLINGTON,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3626	
			DATE MAILED: 09/14/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No. Applicant(s)  09/473,136 BERGERT, THOMAS F.			
Advisory Action			SF.	St
· ·	Examiner	Art Unit	<del></del>	
	Alexander Kalinowski	3626		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 30 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears amination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced in a simely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a cation in	ıed
_	PLY [check either a) or b)]			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S	See MPEP	
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	ension fee ( (2) as set fo	under orth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:			
(a)  they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);		
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifyin	g the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of t	finally rejected clair	ns.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		eparate, timely filed	d amendr	nent
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See	r reconsideration has been cons	idered but does NC	OT place t	the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	•	to issues which we	re newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	(s) a) will not be entered or bould be rejected is provided belo	will be entered ow or appended.	and an	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected:				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
8. $\square$ The drawing correction filed on is a) $\square$ app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.		
<ol><li>Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer</li></ol>	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	//	11	
0. Other:		alisa de	Plilon	el l
		Alexander Kalinows Examiner Art Unit: 3626		

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the Examiner has not presented a prima facie case since none of the applied prior art references either singly or in combination teach the claimed invention. In addition, Applicant argues that the Henneuse reference does not disclose an available venue reservation. The Examiner disagrees. The Examiner has presented a prima facie case under 35 USC 103 by addressing all claimed limitations and citing motivation to combine the references directly from the references themselves. Furthermore, Applicant's argument directed to the Henneuse reference is nonpersuasive. The Examiner did not use the Henneuse reference to disclose an available venue reservation. The Examiner used the Teemaster reference to disclose available reservations for claim 1, claim 17 and claim 18, and the GolfAgent reference to disclose available venue reservations in claim 21. Furthermore, Henneuse was used solely to disclose providing acceptance information from other participants and providing information to other participants limitation. Therefore, Applicant's arguments are nonpersuasive and the rejection of claims 1-23 are maintained.